

Social Questions Bulletin

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, in alliance with the
opportunities for social progress and to promote social justice
social justice
jects the method of the
nom have for society
social economic planning
spec last in group

Rev. Fred D. Gealy,
Southern Methodist Univ.,
Dallas, Texas

Sup

Volume 41

MAY, 1951

Number 5

FEDERATION ASKS END TO KOREAN WAR

By vote of the Executive Committee MFSA endorsed the following Resolution introduced in the Senate May 17, 1951, by Senator Edwin C. Johnson of Colorado:

"Whereas, to permit civilization to be destroyed by World War III is utter insanity and unworthy of the men of this century, and Whereas, the Korean War has every appearance of being a hopeless conflict of attrition and indecisive and a breeder of bitter racial hatred, and

Whereas, a limited war, like a limited or smoldering fire, is gravely dangerous, for it may burst forth into a world-wide conflagration at any moment, and

Whereas, the North and South Koreans, the Chinese and the United Nations have suffered more than one million casualties, with the only tangible results so far the indescribable misery which has been heaped upon the Korean people, and

Whereas, tremendous strides have been made in the development of hither-to un-used lethal and destructive weapons of war with the potential of unbearable fury and horror, and

Whereas, by slaughtering additional millions of humans, an uneasy peace might, in time, be forced upon the vanquished, and

Whereas, the people of the United States traditionally have held the people of China in the highest esteem and affection and still do, and

Whereas, the people of the United States have long recognized the wisdom of the slogan "Asia for Asiatics," if it were to be applied to Asia, and

Whereas, it has long been the policy of the American people that no nation should seek to extend its form of government on any other nation or people, but that as an inherent right every people should be left free to determine its own form of government and its own way of life unhindered and unafraid, the little along with the great and the powerful, and

Whereas, the traditional policy and desire of the people of the United States of America is now and has been a just and enduring peace, and

Whereas, it is never too early for God-fearing and peace-loving people to earnestly endeavour to stop needless human slaughter now,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations call upon all nations and all groups now engaged in the war in Korea to cease fire and declare an armistice effective at 4:00 A.M. Korean time, June 25, 1951 and that prior thereto the United Nations forces retire to points south and the opposing forces retire to points north of the 38th Parallel, and before Dec. 31, 1951 all prisoners of the Korean war be exchanged and all non-Korean persons military and non-military, except the ordinary diplomatic representatives, shall depart from North and South Korea."

How do you react to this peace proposal? Let us hear. If you approve, send congratulations and appreciation to Senator Johnson; and ask your own Senators and Representative to introduce or support a similar proposal. And ask the President and Secretary of State Acheson to take advantage of the chance for honorable peace in Korea opened up by China's acceptance of the proposal made in a U.N. Broadcast June 23 by Mr. Jacob Malik, head of the U.S.S.R.'s U.N. delegation—that the belligerents in Korea arrange an immediate end to the costly slaughter and a withdrawal of their respective armed forces from the vicinity of the 38th Parallel. U.N. leader Trygve Lie quickly concurred with this statement: "In recent weeks the qualified spokesmen of many of the governments whose forces are participating in the United Nations action in Korea, and I, as Secretary-General, have expressed hope for a military cease-fire in Korea, in the vicinity of the 38th Parallel. The delegate of the U.S.S.R., Deputy Foreign Minister Jacob Malik, has now also expressed his hope for such a cease-fire. . . . The United Nations has made it clear again and again that the first step to the restoration of peace in Korea must be a cease-fire."

PEACE APPEAL DISTURBS STOCK MARKET

The following headlines topped two articles on the financial page of the conservative N. Y. Times, June 26. Do they throw further light on the relationship between our economy and war? "RUMORS OF PEACE DISTURB STAPLES — COMMODITY FUTURES HERE MOVE SHARPLY LOWER AS DROP IN SPENDING IS FEARED." "PEACE BID BRINGS SLUMP IN STOCKS — SOVIET OVERTURES FOR A KOREAN CEASE-FIRE RESULT IN TWO DRASTIC SELLING WAVES — INROADS WIDEST IN MONTHS."

CONGRESS AUTHORIZES SURPLUS WHEAT FOR INDIA

Belatedly Congress voted a loan to India to facilitate purchase there of surplus wheat in the U. S. A.—to allay serious starvation in India. The belated action was due in large measure to persistent Church stands, including that of MFSA through vote of its Executive Committee to approve a statement on Wheat for India prepared by W. W. Reid and contending that: "This question should be decided upon the humanitarian issue involved. If it is not, then we stand discredited before the eyes of the world—and before our God. Of what use then are our words concerning brotherhood, and charity, and being our brother's keeper, and the children of one God? No one will believe us—how could they?"

MFSA REITERATES OPPOSITION TO U.M.T.

Wide Church opposition to Universal Military Training did not prevent adoption of such legislation for the first time in America's peacetime history—one more illustration of our growing militarization and of the defeat which this brings to the ideals and principles of the Church. The MFSA Executive Committee renewed MFSA and Church opposition to U.M.T. by adopting a statement against it prepared by Wayne White before the legislation was enacted. The statement cited U.M.T.'s totalitarian and militaristic threat to peace, to Christian ideals, to democracy, to moral standards, and to the practice of equality. The task now is to see that this recent authorization of U.M.T. at some future date is never implemented—and that the legislation is repealed as soon as possible. Let your Congressman, Senators and President hear from you on this vital question! Congress is expected to receive and vote on a specific U.M.T. implementation plan before summer's end.

FEDERATION SENDS MESSAGE TO JAMES LAWSON

Acting for MFSA the Executive Committee voted to approve the following statement prepared by Loyd Worley as a message to James Lawson, an Executive Committee member and national Methodist youth leader:

"Your fellow Federationists regard your treatment grossly unjust and contrary to best Christian American traditions. We assure you of our sympathy and prayers. The example of your moral stature under persecution will inspire many. Acts 5:29, II Corinthians 4:17."

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

"Six Men Amend the Constitution" was the title of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial against the Smith Act decision. Specifically these men cut the heart out of Article I of the Bill of Rights in relation to basic social change. In doing this they made possible the suppression of opposition to war policies and preparations. Also as the conservative press has recognized, with misgivings, they legalized the suppression of a political party for the first time in our history.

The ground for this curtailment of the constitutional liberties of all citizens was laid by limiting the issue in the acceptance of the case. The defendants were indicted for conspiring to organize the Communist Party, and to use speech, printed matter and classes to teach and advocate the forcible overthrow of government. Their defense was threefold. We did not conspire to, nor did we teach and advocate, the forcible overthrow of the government. We did not get a fair trial. It is unconstitutional to prohibit teaching and advocating. The Supreme Court, the two dissenters from the later decision—Black and Douglas—objecting, took only the question of constitutionality. This is an unreal separation. Constitutionality cannot be settled in a vacuum.

Consequently the Vinson opinion begins by contradicting itself. Having twice stated that the question of guilt is not under consideration Vinson then cites as the base for his argument the findings of guilt by the lower courts. "Congress was concerned with the very kind of activity in which the evidence showed these petitioners engaged" is the summary. The findings of the disputed verdict that was refused review are assumed as fact throughout the argument.

The disastrous nature of the unreal separation of the constitutional from the other issues in the case appears in Vinson's use of the clear and present danger rule as the main base of his opinion. That the teachings of the Communist Party, carried on for 21 years before this indictment, were such a danger to the government was too obvious an absurdity for two of the concurring justices—Frankfurter and Jackson—to endorse. Vinson tries to get around this, as Medina in the trial court and Learned Hand in the Appellate court had done before him, by transposing clear and present into predictable future danger. For this there is no objective test. The accused are at the mercy of the opinions of judges.

This destruction of constitutional guarantees of justice is increased by Vinson's upholding of Medina's refusal to submit to the jury the factual question of whether a clear and present danger exists. The extent of the judicial usurpation of power attempted in this decision appears when Vinson tries to cover it with the duty of "the Government" to act in time, and again with the truism that an attempt to overthrow the government by force "is a sufficient evil for Congress to prevent." That is provided for by the laws regarding treason, conspiracy and espionage; and it is the duty of the executive not the judiciary to decide when they should be enforced.

Another danger appears when Vinson deals with the question of intent. The fallacy here is a false comparison, in which criminal overt acts are equated with teaching and advocating without any charge of overt acts. This is done with much unnecessary citation in the course of which intent becomes "a precise mental state." It is obvious, for example, that intent is the "essential element" in the difference between murder and manslaughter and is susceptible to proof. But how does that show that "an intent to overthrow the government of the United States by advocacy thereof is equally susceptible of proof." In the former case the proof is factual. In the latter it is an interpretation of a "mental state," unless there is advocacy of overt acts. Against an adverse interpretation, there is only one disproof, the record of what actually was taught. This the trial judge refused to admit and his conduct the Supreme Court refused to review.

The Vinson opinion is earmarked throughout as a political not a judicial finding. The Smith Act was passed in '40 in a war atmosphere. It was upheld under the pressure of war hysteria. Hand wrote two pages on "the condition of the world." Vinson emphasized the "inflammable nature of world conditions." His talk about not waiting for "a putsch" is cut from the same cloth as the provision in the McCarran Act for the internment of dangerous persons. These two laws are additional proof that modern total war and democracy are incompatible.

In the guise of preventing force and violence the Smith Act decision throws a barrier across the only road to peaceful social change. Unless the people of this country see through the deception and pull the barrier down in time that road will be permanently closed to them.

H. F. W.

SUPREME COURT OPINIONS IN THE CASE OF THE COMMUNIST LEADERS Dissent of Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black

These petitioners were not charged with an attempt to overthrow the Government. They were not charged with non-verbal acts of any kind designed to overthrow the Government. They were not even charged with saying anything or writing anything designed to overthrow the Government. The charge was that they agreed to assemble and to talk and publish certain ideas at a later date: The indictment is that they conspired to organize the Communist Party and to use speech or newspapers and other publications in the future to teach and advocate the forcible overthrow of the Government. No matter how it is worded, this is a virulent form of prior censorship of speech and press, which I believe the First Amendment forbids. I would hold § 3 of the Smith Act authorizing this prior restraint unconstitutional on its face and as applied.

But let us assume, contrary to all constitutional ideas of fair criminal procedure, that petitioners although not indicted for the crime of actual advocacy, may be punished for it. Even on this radical assumption, the only way to affirm these convictions, as the dissent of Mr. Justice Douglas shows, is to qualify drastically or wholly repudiate the established "clear and present danger" rule. This the Court does in a way which greatly restricts the protections afforded by the First Amendment. The opinions for affirmance show that the chief reason for jettisoning the rule is the expressed fear that advocacy of Communist doctrine endangers the safety of the Republic. To the Founders of this Nation, however, the benefits derived from free expression were worth the risk. They embodied this philosophy in the First Amendment's command that Congress "shall make no law abridging . . . the freedom of speech, or of the press. . . ." I have always believed that the First Amendment is the keystone of our Government, that the freedoms it guarantees provide the best insurance against destruction of all freedom. At least as to speech in the realm of public matters, I believe that the "clear and present danger" test does not "mark the furthestmost constitutional boundaries of protected expression" but does "no more than recognize a minimum compulsion of the Bill of Rights." *Bridges v. California*

So long as this Court exercises the power of judicial review of legislation, I cannot agree that the First Amendment permits us to sustain laws suppressing freedom of speech and press on the basis of Congress' or our own notions of mere "reasonableness." Such a doctrine waters down the First Amendment so that it amounts to little more than an admonition to Congress. The Amendment as so construed is not likely to protect any but those "safe" or orthodox views which rarely need its protection. I must also express my objection to the holding because it sanctions the determination of a crucial issue of fact by the judge rather than by the jury. Nor can I let this opportunity pass without expressing my objection to the severely limited grant of certiorari in this case which precluded consideration here of at least two other reasons for reversing these convictions: (1) the record shows a discriminatory selection of the jury panel which prevented trial before a representative cross-section of the community; (2) the record shows one member of the trial jury was violently hostile to petitioners before and during the trial.

Public opinion being what it now is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners. There is hope, however, that in calmer times, when present pressures, passions and fears subside, this or some later Court will restore the First Amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society.

MFSA STAND ON THE SMITH ACT AND ON THE IMPRISONMENT OF INDIVIDUALS UNDER IT

"The right of any individual to speak his mind as to what is right or wrong is democracy's best safeguard. We therefore call for repeal of the Smith Act as being unconstitutional, and designed to suppress any unpopular political philosophies. We appeal for Presidential amnesty for all convicted under the Smith Act."

If you agree with this MFSA stand, adopted by the last national membership meeting, write the President. And why not thank Justices William O. Douglas and Hugo Black for their courageous defense of free speech? One important moral and social aspect of the case of the convicted Communist leaders is the pending imprisonment of their lawyers, due to refusal of the Supreme Court (again with Justices Black and Douglas dissenting) to review their contempt sentences. Speaking for MFSA the Wilberforce membership meeting declared: "We protest a developing pattern of judicial punishment of lawyers who defend politically unpopular persons."

Dissenting Statements of Justice Douglas

"If this were a case where those who claimed protection under the First Amendment were teaching the techniques of sabotage, the assassination of the President, the filching of documents from public files, the planting of bombs, the art of street warfare, and the like, I would have no doubts. . . . No such evidence was introduced at the trial. There is a statute which makes a seditious conspiracy unlawful.

So far as the present record is concerned, what petitioners did was to organize people to teach and themselves teach the Marxist-Leninist doctrine contained chiefly in four books. But if the books themselves were not outlawed, by what reasoning does their use in a classroom become a crime?

The crime depends not on what is taught but on who the teacher is. That is to make freedom of speech turn not on *what is said*, but on the *intent* with which it is said. Once we start down that road we enter territory dangerous to the liberties of every citizen.

There was a time in England when men were punished not for raising a hand against the king but for thinking murderous thoughts about him. The Framers of the Constitution were alive to that abuse. Treason was defined to require overt acts—the evolution of a plot against the country into an actual project. The present case is not one of treason. But the analogy is close when the illegality is made to turn on intent, not on the nature of the act. We then start probing men's minds for motive and purpose; they become entangled in the law not for what they did but for *what they thought*; they get convicted not for what they said but for the purposes with which they said it.

The doctrine of conspiracy has served divers and oppressive purposes and in its broad reach can be made to do great evil. But never until today has anyone seriously thought that the ancient law of conspiracy could constitutionally be used to turn speech into seditious conduct. Yet that is precisely what is suggested. I repeat that we deal here with speech alone, not with speech *plus* acts of sabotage or unlawful conduct. Not a single seditious act is charged in the indictment. To make a lawful speech unlawful because two men conceive it is to raise the law of conspiracy to appalling proportions. That course is to make a radical break with the past and to violate one of the cardinal principles of our constitutional scheme.

Free speech . . . protection is essential to the very existence of a democracy. . . . releases pressures which otherwise might become destructive. Full and free discussion exposes false (ideas). . . . has been the first article of our faith. We have founded our political system on it. It has been the safeguard of every religious, political, philosophical, economic and racial group amongst us. . . .

I had assumed that the question of the clear and present danger, being so critical an issue in the case, would be a matter for submission to the jury.

Yet, whether the question is one for the Court or the jury, there should be evidence of record on the issue. This record contains no evidence whatsoever showing that the acts charged have created any clear and present danger. . . .

Free speech—the glory of our system of government—should not be sacrificed on anything less than plain and objective proof of danger that the evil advocated is imminent. . . .

The First Amendment provides that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech." The Constitution provides no exception. . . .

The First Amendment reflects the philosophy of Jefferson "that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order." The political censor has no place in our public debates. Our aim should be to keep speech unfettered and allow the processes of law to be invoked only when the provocateurs among us move from speech to action."

Conclusion of Justice Jackson's Concurring Opinion

"I have little faith in the long-range effectiveness of this conviction to stop the rise of the Communist movement. Communism will not go to jail with these Communists. No decision by this Court can forestall revolution whenever the existing government fails to command the respect and loyalty of the people and sufficient distress and discontent is allowed to grow up among the masses. Many failures by fallen governments attest that no government can long prevent revolution by outlawry."

"Corruption, ineptitude, inflation, oppressive taxation, militarization, injustice, and loss of leadership capable of intellectual initiative in domestic or foreign affairs are allies on which the Communists count to bring opportunity knocking to their door. Sometimes I think they may be mistaken. But the Communists are not building just for today—the rest of us might profit by their example."

From Justice Frankfurter's Concurring Opinion

"Suppressing advocates of overthrow inevitably will also silence critics who do not advocate overthrow but fear that their criticism may be so construed. No matter how clear we may be that the defendants now before us are preparing to overthrow our Government at the propitious moment, it is self-delusion to think that we can punish them for their advocacy without adding to the risks run by loyal citizens who honestly believe in some of the reforms these defendants advance. It is a sobering fact that in sustaining the conviction before us we can hardly escape restriction on the interchange of ideas."

Justice Frankfurter, though upholding the Smith Act constitutionality, seriously questioned its wisdom: "Much that should be rejected as illiberal, because repressive and evenenoming, may well be not unconstitutional. A persistent, positive translation of the liberating faith into the feelings and thoughts and actions of men and women is the real protection against attempts to strait-jacket the human mind. Such temptations will have their way, if fear and hatred are not exorcised. The mark of a truly civilized man is confidence in the strength and security derived from the inquiring mind. Without open minds there can be no open society. And if society be not open the spirit of man is mutilated and becomes enslaved."

Thus, of 8 Supreme Court Justices participating in this decision upholding the Smith Act, and the conviction to imprisonment and fines of Communist Party leaders (Justice Clark did not participate)—four of them (one-half) challenged the wisdom of the Act and the repression of free speech involved.

CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION PROTESTS DECISION, ASKS SMITH ACT REPEAL

The American Civil Liberties Union, in an official statement, opposed the majority decision, declared that it emasculated the vital "clear and present danger" test, reaffirmed belief that the Smith Act is both unconstitutional and unwise, called for the repeal of this and all similar repressive legislation, and expressed "the profound and lasting gratitude of free men" to the four justices who challenged the Smith Act's wisdom, and to Justices Black and Douglas who also challenged its constitutionality.

The Union declared:

"The most frightening aspect of this decision is that judges, legislators, executive officers of the government, and the public generally may take it as *precedent and authority and encouragement* for prohibiting the free speech of many other people besides the Communist Party leaders—perhaps including even people who merely want to discuss, as individuals, under non-dangerous circumstances, ideas far less explosive than the idea of revolution. The American people should stop that tendency, and reverse it. It is not just the individual citizens seeking to exercise free speech who need it. *The nation* needs the free speech of all its individual citizens—to remain a strong nation in a time of international struggle, to remain a free society, and to remain a country in which faults are corrected and new virtues developed.

The decision of the Supreme Court upholding the conviction of the Eleven Communist leaders is an unfortunate defeat for democracy, whose faith and values are now being tested throughout the world.

It is the responsibility—and privilege—of those who uphold freedom of speech as an absolute fundamental of democratic life to continue zealously to defend the First Amendment."

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year

25c per copy

Issued monthly, except July, August and September
METHODIST FEDERATION for SOCIAL ACTION
(Unofficial)

Executive Secretary and Editor—JACK R. McMICHAEL
Officers: President, Bishop Francis J. McConnell; Vice-Presidents: Bishop James C. Baker, Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, Dean Walter G. Muelder, Bishop Donald Tippet, Rev. Edgar Wahlberg; Recording Secretary: Edgar Love; Treasurer: Gilbert Q. LeSourd; Asst. Treasurer: William W. Reid.

Editorial Office and Office of Publication,
150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.

Re-entered as second class matter Feb. 19, 1951, at the Postoffice at New York 11, N. Y., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

129

QUAKERS STRIKE ANOTHER BLOW FOR PEACE

"Steps to Peace—A Quaker View of U. S. Foreign Policy" is an immensely valuable contribution to understanding of U. S. foreign policy and of the reasons for its failure to achieve the basic objectives of the American people, or to win or maintain the support of the peoples of Europe or Asia—areas in which the Quakers have much first-hand experience.

The quotations which follow are lifted from Chapter III of the report, "Why Has Our Policy Failed?"

"Asia and Europe are two areas where Quakers have had the greatest opportunity to observe events during the past thirty years. This firsthand experience enables them to speak with more conviction about the reasons American policy has failed. . . .

Our policy in Asia has failed to lead us to the real objectives of the American people because its preoccupation with strategy and ideology has prevented our giving sufficient weight to the economic, social, and political realities of Asia. . . .

Quaker workers, during years of service in the troubled Orient, have witnessed the great changes taking place and the increasing hostility with which the United States has regarded them.

It is surprising we have not been able to understand Asia. Our own independence was achieved through revolution. . . . The current revolution in Asia is similar, whatever its present association with Soviet Communism. There, nearly half the world's people are embarked on a campaign to win self-determination and economic advancement . . . freedom from colonialism and from outside interference in Asian politics. Here again, Americans, with their Monroe Doctrine, should be able to understand.

We allowed ourselves to become involved in China's civil war. As we know from experience, civil war is bitter. Outside interference may create hatred even greater than towards the domestic enemy. We supported the losing side, are feared and distrusted by the new Chinese government; many other peoples of Asia, once our friends and admirers, also distrust us, for they, too, are on the side of revolution. Our apparent abandonment of traditional American sympathy for peoples seeking independence looks to them like power politics.

The great fact of Asia is poverty. Poverty has always bred violence. The people of Asia would have adopted a radical solution to their urgent economic problems if Communism and Soviet Russia had never existed. . . . Our preoccupation with strategic considerations in the struggle against Soviet Communism has blinded us to the actual situation in Asia. . . . *The roots of revolution are economic and social, not Russian*, and whatever policy we adopt should deal fundamentally with poverty and outworn social patterns if it is to have any chance. . . . The internal corruption has alienated Asian governments from their peoples. This was particularly true of the Nationalist regime in China. . . . Behind Asia's belligerence toward the West lies a century of humiliation and exploitation of proud people by white imperialists. . . .

Our own revolutionary experience demonstrated sufficiently the great strength of an aroused people devoted to its revolutionary aim against the opposition of foreign powers, alone or in coalition.

Yet the United States has intervened or threatened to do so not only in China, Formosa and Korea, but also in Indo-China, and to most Asians even our policy in Japan and the Philippines appears to be dominated by the same strategic considerations.

In China it is extremely doubtful whether American military intervention could achieve lasting results. A much weaker and less united China successfully resisted Japan. . . . The relatively small army of Chiang on Formosa could be no more effective now than when it held most of China, buttressed by large-scale American support, and yet was overwhelmingly defeated. Anti-Communist guerrillas are a small minority in a country that clearly prefers its new government.

In Korea American military intervention, even with the moral backing of the United Nations, has failed so far to achieve its immediate aims and has increased Asian suspicion of American purposes, in Asian eyes, a direct attack by the United States upon the whole

body of revolutionary Asia. China, sensitive in her new nationalism, and suspicious of the United States because of our prominent participation in her civil war, felt that she had reasonable grounds for her own intervention in Korea when United Nations forces, which were in fact largely American and commanded by an American whose hostility to the new government was well known, were rapidly advancing toward Chinese territory. Any American should understand this by imagining his reactions if an international army, under Russian command and largely Russian, were rapidly advancing northward through Mexico, particularly if the United States had been excluded from the international organization in whose name the advance was made. More attention to Chinese reaction was urged on us by both Asian and European nations, but our preoccupation with strategy led to the ill-fated drive to the Manchurian border, and the subsequent loss of our original aim in Korea, not to mention the loss of lives on both sides.

United States policy is in danger of similar failure in Formosa and Indo-China if, in forming our policy, we allow purely military considerations to outweigh Asian realities.

The evidence indicates that wherever in Asia American policy has been dominated by military considerations and has ignored the nature of the revolutions taking place there, it has failed, and is bound to fail, to advance the real purposes of the United States. Moreover, our mistaken confidence in our ability to achieve our purposes in Asia by means of force has lost us a number of opportunities to negotiate a settlement. In Korea. . . . And would not the Japanese peace treaty be more permanent if her most powerful and influential neighbors, China and the Soviet Union, had been included in the negotiations from the beginning?

As regards China herself negotiation offers the only sound prospect. China wants recognition as an equal among neighbors; negotiation can restore the mutual respect and mutual security which force has destroyed. Specifically, China wants admission to the United Nations, control over Formosa (considered by Chinese more a part of China than Hawaii is of the United States), and a Korean settlement that will not leave in power a regime hostile to the revolution. None of these desires would jeopardize any legitimate American objective. Negotiation can operate successfully. Force can only aggravate, but not resolve, existing tensions.

Americans should listen to the voice of Asia, and give our government the opportunity to formulate a policy based on Asian conditions.

From war in Asia, limited or unlimited, or even from continued hostility, America could gain nothing except growing enmity and strength against us. Let us try another way.

American Policy in Europe

Europe wants peace, international stability, and a share of responsibility for the solution of her own problems . . . unlikely unless there is peaceful accommodation between the United States and the Soviet Union. Many Europeans are confident that the basis of a satisfactory settlement of European issues can be discovered by patient and persistent negotiation. For Europe the "Eastern Question" (Russia) is a very old problem, and from experience Europeans believe that it is a negotiable one. Consequently, they are not impressed when the United States, as a newcomer in the arena of close relationships with Russia, concludes from the devious tactics of the Soviet Union that diplomacy is useless and that "force is the only language the Russians understand."

For these reasons, the gradual shift of American policy away from reconstruction and toward military strategy in the struggle with Russia has been greeted with misgiving.

Every Federationist should secure and study the entire report (at 25c per copy from American Friends' Service Committee, 20 South 12 Street, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania)—including the final chapter which gives an alternative program to our present policies. (See April Bulletin.)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SETS NATIONAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING FOR SEPTEMBER
4TH - 6TH IN EVANSTON, ILLINOIS. PLAN NOW TO ATTEND AND SEE THAT YOUR
CHAPTER IS WELL REPRESENTED. AND SEND US YOUR PROGRAM SUGGESTIONS.

SEND IN YOUR DUES OR A CONTRIBUTION NOW!

The Federation will not be on vacation this summer. We must all pitch in together to keep our needed education and action work going, for this challenging hour, to support the indispensable Office Secretary, to prepare for the important National Membership Meeting ahead. Coming Bulletins will be packed full of factual information which *you need*. We appreciate our supporters. And we love our non-supporters as well, but can no longer send them the Bulletin without contribution or minimum payment for cost. If in doubt as to your status, let us hear anyhow. Don't let Bishop McConnell's April appeal go unanswered!